

my colleagues to join in support of H.R. 3113 by co-sponsoring this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ECO-TERRORISM, THE CHARACTER COUNTS PROGRAM, MISSILE DEFENSE, AND MILITARY TRIBUNALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to take a few minutes to talk about a number of subjects which I think are very important, especially considering the times that we are in.

The first subject that I want to talk about is domestic terrorism. Specifically, I want to focus in on ecoterrorism and talk a few minutes about that.

Second, an exciting program which has been implemented in many schools across the country, the program Character Counts. This evening I am just going to do kind of a teaser on it and discuss some of the elements of the program, but I intend later to go into much more depth about the program and why it would be important for my colleagues to try to encourage their local schools to adopt the program Character Counts.

Then I would like to move on to a subject which I have addressed many times, and that is missile defense and the importance of missile defense.

I would also like to touch on the military tribunals that the President has proposed for war criminals, not for American citizens but for those individuals who have committed acts of war against the United States.

Keep in mind that military tribunals were first used by George Washington, Abraham Lincoln and President Roosevelt. The United States Supreme Court on a number of occasions has found that military tribunals are constitutional, so our discussion this evening about military tribunals will not be on constitutionality because that issue has been determined. Our discussion this evening should center more instead on why they are necessary, why they are important and of what benefit are military tribunals to the United States of America in its continued and long-lasting fight against terrorism worldwide.

Let me begin with terrorism on a domestic picture. For some reason, over the last few years there seems to be kind of a Robin Hood image given to

those people who are so dedicated to the environment that they think that their dedication to the environment justifies acts of terrorism against the property of others and at some point in time against humans and other citizens in the United States.

This Robin Hood picture is kind of being played on by the media. It is not a noble act. Environmental terrorism is not the way to accomplish their means. There are many active organizations in this country who care very, very deeply about the protection of the environment. Many of us on this floor, including myself, care very deeply about the environment.

Obviously, on many occasions we have a difference of opinion. In fact, on this House floor, the two sides of the aisle are sometimes urban versus rural. We have deeply held differences with the people from the other side of the aisle or with our colleagues from another State. For example, in Colorado we generally find ourselves with strong differences on issues of Colorado water when we discuss that issue with Members from the State of California, which is a large user of water from the Colorado River.

But never on this floor, never on this floor do we engage in conversation or strategy or do we engage in the actual act of terrorism against our colleagues who disagree with us on this floor. We have never even heard of that. It has never been considered. If it were considered, it would be quickly squashed by my colleagues under our own self-policing process. Members just do not do it.

In America we have a process which has been defined more accurately against September 11, a process which allows us a legal venue to carry these disputes. There is no justification for domestic terrorism. I do not care whether we are talking about a bomb on the Greenpeace ship, or a threat on an abortion clinic, or if Members are talking about organizations like ELF, which is an organization completely focused on accomplishing goals for the environment through the tool of terrorism. It has no place in the United States of America.

Recently, I contacted a number of environmental organizations across the country and asked them to join me, to join my coalition, my coalition consisting of several of my colleagues' joint effort with me, our coalition, to come out as a group and speak against, regardless of which side of the spectrum Members are on, come out as a coalition, just like we have done for international terrorism, to come out as a coalition and speak against domestic terrorism under the name of the environment.

I have actually been a little surprised by some of the responses I have received. Over the weekend, there was a nasty article in the Denver Post, a letter to the editor. It is amazing how people squirm to somehow say why do you ask us to join your team against

environmental terrorism? Do you think that we are terrorists? I have never said that. Organizations like the national Sierra Club, other organizations, I do not think that they are terrorists. But there are some organizations that, under the guise of the environment, are terrorists, and they commit acts of terrorism.

It is justified to ask every legitimate organization in this country to join the coalition that we are putting together to speak out as a unified voice, to speak out against acts of terror and against those people who think that it is the lesser evil for protection of the environment.

I had some negative responses to my letter, asking, not accusing anybody of terrorism, asking them to join our team, kind of like the President said, you are either with us or you are not with us. The same context as this letter. Hey, join us, help us. Because, frankly, environmental organizations like the Sierra Club, like some of these other national organizations, a lot of people look to them for guidance on the environment.

In a lot of cases I disagree with the national Sierra Club, not so much with the local but the national policies, especially when it regards the Colorado Rockies in my district. But the fact is I have never considered that organization or the organization of Greenpeace a terrorist organization. They do not advocate it. I have never seen any evidence that they are proponents of terrorism.

On the other hand, these groups are nationally recognized, and perhaps some of the radicals who are committing ecoterrorist acts will listen to what these organizations say and listen to their experienced opinion that terrorism does nothing but hurt the cause. It does not help forward the cause of the environment. Committing acts of ecoterrorism, as they did in my district and throughout this Nation, those acts did not further the cause of the environment.

In fact, what it does is it makes the people who really care about the environment, the organizations like the national Sierra Club and others, it kind of draws them in by association. Even though they are not associated, it draws them in by association and starts to give a black eye to what otherwise might be a legitimate cause.

□ 2015

So why would someone not join our effort, our coalition? I got some positive responses, though, and I think some very mature responses, one might say, very well thought-out responses. I would like to read one of them from the Natural Resources Defense Council:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCINNIS and CHAIRMAN HANSEN:

Thank you for your letter of October 30 in which you and your colleagues invited us to repeat our long-held position concerning violence by some who claim to be part of the environmental movement. Let me state, therefore, that the Natural Resources Defense